



**Full Council**  
3 March 2014

**Report from the Strategic Director of  
Regeneration and Growth and  
Strategic Director of Environment  
and Neighbourhoods**

For Action

Wards Affected:  
All

**Potential impact of HS2 on regeneration proposals in Brent**

**1. Summary**

- 1.1 Members' are asked, if considered expedient, to resolve to oppose the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill ('HS2 Bill') introduced into the House of Commons on 25 November 2013 and also, if deemed expedient, that the Council should consider the passing of the further resolutions set out below to authorise the deposit of a petition against the Bill in either or both Houses of Parliament.
- 1.2 This report explains why the proposals contained within the HS2 Bill and supporting documentation are considered to have an injurious affect on the interests of the Council. The HS2 scheme includes plans to construct a ventilation shaft and auto transformer on an important proposed development site next to Queens Park Station in South Kilburn. Construction of a shaft and transformer in this location would serve the proposed new high speed railway which would be running in tunnel at this location. The proposed ventilation shaft and transformer would have an adverse impact not only on that site but also on the Council's regeneration plans for the wider South Kilburn area as is more fully explained within this report. Possible alternatives to the HS2 proposals are also explored. This report also considers whether the HS2 Bill should include provision for a new rail link to the West Coast Main Line and examines whether any other aspect of the HS2 Bill, such as the powers of compulsory acquisition being sought over land belonging to the Council should be opposed and petitioned against in Parliament.

## **2. Recommendations**

That Council consider the potential impacts of the current proposals for HS2 in Brent, and refer the issue on to full Council to consider the following resolutions:

- 2.1 In pursuance of section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972, it is expedient for the Council to oppose the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill introduced into the House of Commons on 25 November 2013; and
- 2.2 Subject to the above, the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth, in consultation with the Lead Member of Regeneration and Major Projects, be authorised to take all such steps as may be necessary or expedient to carry paragraph 2.1 into effect including all steps required for the Council to deposit a petition against the Bill and thereafter to maintain and, if considered appropriate, withdraw its opposition to the Bill; and
- 2.3 That the Common Seal of the Council may be affixed to any documents required to be sealed in connection with the submission of any such petition and the subsequent opposition to the Bill and that the Council's Parliamentary Agents be authorised to sign and deposit the petition on behalf of the Council.

## **3. Impacts of HS2 Bill and possible issues for petition**

- 3.1 The HS2 Bill seeks statutory authorisation for the carrying out of works and the acquisition of land in connection with the construction, operation and thereafter maintenance of a new high speed railway line between London and the West Midlands. If enacted, the Bill will provide the necessary legal authority for land to be compulsorily acquired and, at the same time, deem planning permission to be granted for the carrying out of development authorised by the Bill.
- 3.2 Those who enjoy the necessary legal standing and who wish to formally object to the proposals contained within the HS2 Bill may do so by depositing a Petition in Parliament during a fixed period of time set for that purpose. This Petitioning period will take place following Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Commons, which is currently expected to take place in late April 2014. Before the Council may oppose the HS2 Bill through the deposit of a Petition, section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972 requires that a resolution of the Council to oppose a Bill is passed by a majority of the whole number of the members of the authority at a meeting.
- 3.3 There are a number of good reasons for the Council to offer broad strategic support for HS2 notably because of the opportunity it creates to improve connectivity for Brent residents generally and improved links to future job opportunities in regeneration areas such as Old Oak Common in particular. Despite this broad strategic support officers have identified three negative effects of the HS2 proposals on the borough. The first issue is that the Bill seeks powers for the compulsory acquisition of land in South Kilburn which does not appear to be required to implement the proposed new high speed railway line. The second is the proposal to construct a ventilation shaft and auto transformer on an important proposed development site in South Kilburn next to Queens Park Station. The third is the lack of provision within the current HS2 proposals for a new rail

connection between the new high speed railway and Crossrail lines and the West Coast Main Line.

### **Compulsory Acquisition of Council land**

- 3.4 The HS2 Bill would grant the Secretary of State powers to compulsorily acquire interests in land belonging to the Council, including parts of the South Kilburn Estate including St Marys School, parts of Site 11b, Alpha and Gorefield Houses and the new development on Cambridge Road and Chichester road as identified on the plan at Appendix 1 to this report. The identified land has been included within Schedule A which provides rights to compulsorily acquire all interests in the land.
- 3.5 The HS2 Bill also includes powers to take possession of land and buildings on a temporary basis (for instance where land is only required during construction of the new railway). Officers are not aware of any reason why the land in Appendix 1 needs to be acquired permanently and will continue discussions with HS2 Limited to understand why these areas of land have been identified for permanent acquisition. If HS2 Limited confirms that the Secretary of State does intend to permanently acquire these properties and land then it is recommended that the Council considers whether it is expedient to oppose the proposed permanent acquisition of the land through petitioning against the Bill on this basis.

### **Vent Shaft and Transformer on the Queens Park Car Park site**

- 3.6 The Queens Park Car Park site (known as Site 18 within the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme) is identified through the red boundary shown on plan A at Appendix 2. It forms part of the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme. Brent Council has approved a scheme (subject to signing a planning obligation) on Site 18 for the demolition of the existing buildings (including Cullen House, Keniston Press, TfL offices at Premier House and the Falcon Public House) and the erection of 137 flats (of which 39 will be affordable) together with new public open space, 1,270 square metres of commercial shop space and 959 square metres of replacement office space for TfL. The proposed development includes the stopping up of the gyratory system and the introduction of a new signalled junction at Kilburn Lane and Salusbury Road/Carlton Vale.
- 3.7 Site 18 forms an intrinsic part of the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme. The Programme assumes the disposal of Site 18. Its disposal would have secured a significant capital receipt to reinvest directly back into the delivery of the next phase of the Programme. The Programme also assumes that Site 18 will deliver 39 affordable properties for existing South Kilburn residents to support the Programme's decant strategy and transform perceptions of South Kilburn by delivering a high quality mixed use development at a gateway site reconnecting South Kilburn to neighbouring Queens Park. If the Council is unable to dispose of Site 18 due to the proposals in the HS2 Bill, this would disrupt the wider South Kilburn Regeneration Programme. Firstly, it would result in a lack of new homes to enable the planned decant of residents in south Kilburn, and secondly it would limit house value uplift that the Council would otherwise secure and rely on in order to fund the next phase of the Regeneration Programme. This is in addition to the adverse impacts of the proposal on amenity which will have an effect on value.

- 3.8 The Site 18 ownership map is attached at Appendix 2. The London Borough of Brent is the freehold owner of Cullen House and the Salusbury Road Car Park. However there are a number of others who hold freehold interests in Site 18. On 18<sup>th</sup> July 2011 the Executive authorised the making of compulsory purchase orders ('CPOs') to acquire (a) all interests and rights in Site 18 (comprising the Queen's Park car park, the Keniston Press site, TfL offices, Cullen House and the Falcon Pub) and (b) any new rights in the CPO land which may be required under section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 in Site 18 comprising the Queen's Park Station Area.
- 3.9 On 18<sup>th</sup> July 2011 it was reported to the Executive that HS2 Limited was developing proposals to locate a 130m<sup>2</sup> ventilation shaft on the south-west corner of Site 18 in order to service an HS2 running tunnel proposed to be constructed at this location. Given the uncertainty created by the HS2 proposals, Officers have not progressed the acquisition of third party interests within Site 18 pursuant to the CPOs secured in July 2011 nor has a development partner yet been procured to build out the planning permission secured. On 19<sup>th</sup> September 2011 the Executive authorised Officers to issue the following response to the Government's HS2 consultation: "The Council is proceeding with the development of the Queens Park station site and therefore asks that the vent be located on an alternative site that is of less value to the South Kilburn redevelopment programme. For example, the vent shaft could be located on land to the east of Queens Park station, the Canterbury works site which is currently used as a builders' yard/depot." HS2 Limited subsequently confirmed to the Council that it is technically possible to locate the ventilation shaft within the Canterbury works site but advised that their preferred site remained Site 18 because of the changes that would otherwise be required to the alignment of the proposed HS2 tunnel, access issues and a likely increase in temporary impacts during construction on nearby residents and a local school.
- 3.10 On 30<sup>th</sup> January 2013 Officers responded to the Department for Transport's safeguarding consultation, noting that the Council did not agree with HS2's decision to locate a ventilation shaft on the south-west corner of Site 18. Within the Council's safeguarding consultation response Officers put forward an alternative location for the ventilation shaft at a site referred to as Canterbury Works, behind and including Canterbury House, on Canterbury Road as identified in red on Plan B at Appendix 2. It was explained that this site could be a better location for the proposed ventilation shaft because it was currently in low grade employment use, was not proposed as part of the redevelopment programme and if the Canterbury Works site was selected, this would avoid the adverse impact which would otherwise arise to the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme. On 9<sup>th</sup> July 2013 HS2 Ltd safeguarded part of Site 18 as identified edged red on Plan C at Appendix 3. On 11th November 2013 the Executive Members noted that if the Hybrid Parliamentary High Speed 2 (HS2) Bill ('HS2 Bill') once laid, included provision for a ventilation shaft on Site 18, the question as to whether to oppose the HS2 Bill would be put to Full Council.
- 3.11 The Council commissioned Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) consultants to quantify the social, economic, environmental and financial impact of HS2's proposals for the south-west corner of Site 18 to the Council. LSH also considered the social economic and financial impact of relocating the ventilation shaft to the alternative

Canterbury Works site. In January 2014 LSH completed their social and economic impact study concluding there is a clear economic and financial benefit associated with relocating the ventilation shaft and auto transformer from Site 18 to the alternative Canterbury Works site. The social and economic impact study identified that the Council's possible alternative site at Canterbury Works had significantly less negative financial impacts on the South Kilburn regeneration programme, provided more long term jobs and less environmental impacts than at Site 18. However the social and economic impact study was based on the information presented in the draft Environmental Statement and assumed a reduced development on Site 18 would be brought forward in 9 years. A revised study is now underway (see below).

- 3.12 The HS2 Bill was laid before Parliament in November 2013 with provisions that impact on Site 18. The HS2 Bill increased the size of the auto transformer on Site 18 and included provision for a vent shaft head house, approximately 43m by 19m and approximately 9.5m above ground and an auto transformer station approximately 33m by 16m and 6m above ground level provided on hard standing with a security fence 2.4m in height around the perimeter of the compound as illustrated at Appendix 4.
- 3.13 The deposit of the Bill in Parliament in November 2013 was accompanied by an Environmental Statement which is currently the subject of a consultation exercise. Officers will respond to the consultation by the closure date of 27th February 2014 and in doing so, Officers will challenge the adequacy of the Environmental Statement in the following respects:
- Inadequate consideration of alternative sites for the proposed ventilation shaft and autotransformer
  - No proper justification for the current design and scale of proposals
  - Incorrect baseline assumptions
  - Inaccurate assessment of effects; and
  - Lack of/ inadequate mitigation proposed

A draft of the Environmental Statement Consultation response is a background document to this report.

- 3.14 Officers intend to seek advice as regards the traffic, noise and air quality assessment of the proposed ventilation shaft and auto transformer on each of Site 18 and the proposed alternative, the Canterbury Works Site and also whether there is any scope, technically, for re-design of the proposed ventilation shaft and auto transformer in order to minimise the extent of land required to accommodate this infrastructure, wherever it might be located. The full findings of this report will not be available for consideration before the Council meeting in March 2014. Officers recommend delegating any decision on the detailed case on which the petition will be based to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth. He in turn will base this case on the findings of these further studies when they are available.

## **Further studies required prior to Petitioning the HS2 Bill**

- 3.15 Officers strongly recommend Petitioning the HS2 Bill if the vent shaft and auto-transformer proposal is not withdrawn or modified to the satisfaction of the Council. The Council is commissioning further technical studies to consider the following:
- 3.15.1 Whether the vent shaft and auto-transformer could be located on the Canterbury works site and be so designed to mitigate any potential negative impacts (noise, visual intrusion, safety) on the school and nearby residences and can the construction traffic be routed to minimise impacts on surrounding residents;
  - 3.15.2 Whether there are any other possible alternative sites either for a vent shaft or auto-transformer or both that avoid the negative impacts of locating this infrastructure on site 18;
  - 3.15.3 Whether the proposed auto transformer can be located elsewhere, thereby allowing some housing development to take place

- 3.16 This technical work is being commissioned now because any Petition will need to be submitted by spring/ summer 2014. The Council's legal advice is that any petition against the works at Site 18 is likely to stand a better chance of success if the Council can identify a reasonable alternative.

## **The West Coast Mainline Link (WCML)**

- 3.17 The HS2 proposals include a new interchange at Old Oak Common (OOC) between HS2 and Crossrail. In general terms, the Council supports HS2's proposals at OOC and the surrounding area, including proposed links between the OOC HS2 Crossrail interchange and the West London Line and the North London Line. However, Brent considers that additional value could be achieved if the HS2 Bill had included provision for a new rail link between Crossrail and the West Coast Main Line (WCML). Such a link would benefit not only Brent residents, but also those of Harrow, Watford and further afield along the route of the WCML.
- 3.18 In general terms, this link would allow Brent to be better interconnected with the rail network, reduce time savings on travel and ease congestion at Euston and the proposal is supported by TfL.
- 3.19 A Crossrail – West Coast Mainline link would allow London Midland services travelling from as far north as Tring (and possibly further north) to transfer onto Crossrail, providing improved services straight into central London. London Overground/Bakerloo services would be unaffected and there will be no negative impact on services serving Willesden Junction.
- 3.20 By accommodating the future delivery of this link as part of the HS2 construction plans at Old Oak Common, there would be an opportunity for trains to run to Wembley with a direct link on to Heathrow and services to the West of England.
- 3.21 There are two variations on how the WCML link might be provided, one of which is low cost, making use of the Dudding Hill freight line (estimated at £140m), the

second is high cost by means of a bored tunnel (over £300m). Appendix 5 sets out the two track alignments for each option.

- 3.22 In terms of timing, it is recommended that the Council support the provision of the passive provision enabling works to be built prior to the Old Oak Common station and HS2 being provided. This would effectively “future proof” the rail configuration to enable this link to be provided at a later date. If this future proofing is not delivered as part of the HS2 construction at OOC, costs for its delivery would be significantly higher in future and may not be practical.
- 3.23 HS2 Limited does not agree to assume responsibility for or meet the costs of building the proposed WCML link and Network Rail is now undertaking feasibility studies but will not conclude its work until the end of 2014.
- 3.24 However, there is an important opportunity now to ensure that, in delivering the HS2-Crossrail interchange at OOC, passive provision is included for the desired future link between Crossrail and the WCML. This would reduce the level of cost and disruption that might otherwise arise in delivering the rail link in the future. This passive provision would, as a minimum, require the construction of a bridge structure between the HS2 and Crossrail railway lines enabling the new rail link to be delivered in the future. The estimated cost of enabling works now is considered to be £25million, as compared with the costs of delivering a grade separation at a subsequent stage, which is estimated to be £100million. In addition to these cost savings, early work would avoid future disruption to HS2 and Crossrail services.
- 3.25 It is for these reasons that Officers recommend that the Council considers the expediency of petitioning, or supporting any petition by TfL for the delivery, as part of the HS2 proposals, of WCML Link enabling works at OOC. Officers also recommend that further discussions take place with TfL and other interested parties, including the London Borough of Harrow in this regard.

### **Timetable**

- 3.26 Officers will continue to press HS2 Limited to engage and discuss the above issues with a view to resolving them and thus avoid the need to Petition Parliament. However if the issues remain unresolved and the Council has to Petition the Bill the timetable below sets out a reasonable indication of the current timescales for doing so.

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Possible timings</b>
HS2 Phase 1 Hybrid Bill introduced	25 November 2013 (actual)
Public consultation on ES concludes	27 February 2014 (actual)
Independent assessor prepares report summarising the issues raised by the ES comments within a specified period (of not less than 28 days)	March 2014
Deadline for submission of the ES issues report	25 March – 10 April 2014

Report laid before House (for not less than 14 days)	10 – 25 April 2014
Second Reading	28 – 29 April 4 <b>or</b> May or June 2014
Petitioning Period commences	Early May 2014 <b>or</b> early June 2014
Petitioning deadline	Late May 2014 <b>or</b> late June 2014
Select Committee Proceedings commence	July 2014 <b>or</b> September 2014

#### 4. Legal implications

- 4.0 Pinsent Masons have been appointed by the Council as parliamentary agents to provide advice on the law and process in relation to the HS2 Bill and assist the Council through the preparation and deposit of a petition. Section 239 Local Government Act 1972 requires that any decision to oppose a Bill in Parliament must be decided by resolution of the Full Council and requires the agreement of a majority of members at that meeting. Additional notice requirements must also be complied with in respect of that Meeting and in passing a resolution Members must be satisfied that it is expedient to oppose the HS2 Bill.
- 4.1 The HS2 Bill was introduced into Parliament on 25 November 2013 and a public consultation is currently taking place regarding the content of the Environmental Statement ('ES') produced with the Bill. The ES consultation will end on 27 February 2014, following which an assessor's report will be prepared which summarises the matters raised in the consultation and is made available to MPs to consider before debate at the Second Reading stage. The ES report may be available as early as the beginning of April, in which case Second Reading of the Bill could take place no earlier than in late April. During the Second Reading, the principle of the Bill will be debated and voted upon, following which a period will be fixed for petitions to be deposited against the Bill. The petitioning period is likely to last for approximately 21 days during May or possibly June 2014. In order to petition against the Bill, the Council must pass a resolution by a vote of the majority of the members at a meeting of Full Council pursuant to section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- 4.2 It is proposed that a section 239 resolution will be sought at the next meeting of Full Council on 3 March 2014 and notice of this was published in the local press on 13 February 2014.
- 4.3 Following its production, the ES assessor's report must be laid before Parliament for a period of 14 days before Second Reading of the Bill may take place. This is to allow MPs to read and consider those comments before debating the principle of the Bill at Second Reading.
- 4.4 Second Reading of the Bill is important for a number of reasons. First, it is when the principle of the Bill will be debated and voted on. Matters which have been approved at Second Reading are not open for subsequent consideration, having been approved by the House. This rule means that, following Second Reading it

will not be possible to challenge the 'need' for or principle of HS2 Phase 1. Accordingly, any interested party, including the Council, who wishes to influence the 'need' debate must brief an appropriate Member of the House in advance of Second Reading with a view to persuading that Member to argue and vote accordingly.

- 4.5 Secondly, Second Reading will determine when the period for petitions to be deposited against the Bill will run. If Second Reading is to take place at the end of April, the petitioning period can be expected to fall in May. The petitioning period might expire on 21st May 2014, before the Whitsun recess. In the alternative, if Second Reading does not take place until mid May or early June, the petitioning period will not expire until June.
- 4.6 Once the Second Reading of the Bill has taken place the principle of the Bill cannot be challenged. However, petitions can be submitted to argue for changes to the design of the scheme. Petitioning can result in the Bill being amended, the ES being supplemented (or rewritten) and / or additional mitigation being secured.
- 4.7 If petitions against the Bill are received, as will certainly be the case, a Select Committee will be established to consider the petitions. Although not provided for within the Standing Orders, the Government is likely to allow a period of at least 28 days following the close of the petitioning deadline before the commencement of proceedings before the Select Committee. This is to allow matters raised in petitions to be considered and for the Government to negotiate with petitioners in order to address their concerns. The Government hopes that the Select Committee will sit during the Summer Recess, which may be possible provided the Committee convenes by 21 July 2014 and also agrees to sit in the Recess; the House rises for Summer on 22 July. If the Committee has not convened by this date, its proceedings will not commence until September 2014.
- 4.8 As mentioned above, it is at Second Reading that the principle of the Bill will be debated and voted on. In addition, the Second Reading debate will be an important record of some of the key issues with the proposals. The Members appointed to the Select Committee to consider petitions will be likely to review the Second Reading debate to familiarise themselves with the biggest issues. As such, Second Reading represents an important opportunity to voice concerns / opposition to the Bill, both in principle or in detail and to secure a public record of those concerns. It is therefore recommended that the Council should brief Glenda Jackson MP, the local Member on the key issues of concern regarding the HS2 proposals, particularly the adverse impact of those on the South Kilburn Regeneration programme.
- 4.10 In the period between the passing of any Section 239 resolution on 3 March 2014 and the likely petitioning period in May/June 2014, officers would develop understanding of the impacts of the Bill through commissioning the advice of technical experts on matters of concern. They will also be seeking to engage in discussions with the Department for Transport and HS2 Limited in order to understand whether any design changes, additional mitigation or protection can be secured. In addition, officers will be engaging with neighbouring councils and Transport for London in order to understand whether any of its concerns are shared.. The professional advice received, negotiations with DfT, discussions with

other councils and TfL will determine the final content of the Council's petition against the Bill having regard to the principle matters of concern in this report.

## **5.0 Financial implications**

- 5.1 The first part of the financial case set out below considers the potential loss to the Council of the vent shaft proposals in South Kilburn. The potential benefits of the WCML are also appraised. The second part looks at the estimated costs of petitioning on these matters.

### **South Kilburn**

- 5.2 The costs of Petitioning of the CPO issue are considered to be in the region of £40k if they are alongside petitioning on the vent shaft issue. HS2's proposals will lead to substantial losses to the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme. Although compensation is payable for the compulsory acquisition of land pursuant to the HS2 Bill in accordance with the statutory compensation code. The code provides for compensation to be payable on a market value basis and this can include development value. However, there remains a considerable degree of uncertainty as regard the level of compensation that the Council would receive from the DfT should Site 18 be compulsorily acquired, not least because the Council does not currently own all of the interests in the Site. The compensation offered might only be a fraction of the value that would otherwise be created by the overall development proposals on site 18. Moreover if the Council cannot use Site 18 site for housing, the council will incur significant additional costs, bringing Cullen House up to Decent Homes Standards and needing to re-provide nine more decent units that the Council would otherwise have sold (to act as cross subsidy). In light of the uncertainty as regards the protection which the Code offers in such circumstances, it is clear that several million pounds of value are at risk from the HS2 proposals as they currently stand. Consideration must also be given to the impacts which the proposals at Site 18 might have on the value of retained land nearby. The effect of the vent shaft and auto transformer could reduce the value of land retained by the Council, further adversely impacting the Council's ability to cross subsidise the provision of affordable housing. Even a small percentage effect could have significant effects on the overall programme.

### **WCML link**

- 5.3 The effects of not providing a WCML link are not in the form of direct losses to the Council as in South Kilburn. They are in the form of benefits that may be foregone if the link is not completed. In other words, any link is likely to give parts of the borough a regeneration lift because they become better connected by public transport and this has positive effects on job creation and in encouraging residential and other development that becomes of greater value as a consequence of the improved links.

### **Costs of Petitioning**

- 5.4 The cost estimate for the technical work and external solicitor's advice and representation up to and during any Select Committee hearing are set out in the

table as follows. The costs of the CPO and WCML are additional to the base costs which are included in the Vent shaft costs;

#### Estimated Costs of Petitioning HS2 Bill

	<b>Base Cost (Vent Shaft)</b>	<b>CPO (additional)</b>	<b>WCML link (additional)</b>
Legal advice up to select Cttee	30k	15k	20k
Consultant/technical advice	70k	5k	300k
Legal advice at select cttee inc. Counsel	50k	20k	60k
Total	£150k	£40k	£380k
Recommended	Yes	Yes	No

5.5 There are three main elements to the petitioning process: legal work in preparation, employing technical consultants to produce the evidence required to support the Council's case and then collation and presentation of the Council's case before the Select Committee. Estimates are included in the table above. The Vent Shaft case has been largely constructed and needs some further technical input and £20k of the estimated £150k has been expended so far. Work on the CPO issues is estimated to be minimal. In view of the potential loss to the Council of the vent shaft proposals expenditure on the petition appears worth while. The total cost of petitioning on South Kilburn matters is estimated at approximately £190k.

5.6 As little work has been completed on the feasibility of the WCML link, the costs of carrying out assessment of both the transport and economic benefits of any link would be considerable and £300k is probably the very minimum. For the reasons set out in the report petitioning on this matter is not recommended. The costs of any support to TfL who the Council will urge to petition are expected to be very limited and containable within existing budgets.

5.7 The project cost on Site 18 matters and the CPO matters will be met from the South Kilburn Regeneration Programme budget.

#### **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 South Kilburn is identified as a priority for driving economic opportunity and regeneration within Brent – Our Future 2010-2014 (Brent Borough Plan). The Regeneration Strategy for Brent 2010-2030 identifies the transformational change of South Kilburn within strategic priority 1. The area was previously a New Deal for Communities area and as such, all interventions are specifically targeted at those

people who suffer disadvantage in society. South Kilburn Neighbourhood Trust, through its widening participation seeks to find ways of involving and engaging with all local residents and particularly those who traditionally are 'hard to reach'. There has been and will continue to be widespread consultation and community engagement as proposals for the physical regeneration of the area are developed and delivered.

- 6.2 The new homes in South Kilburn are available to all tenants within the neighbourhood regardless of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity status, marriage and civil partnership status, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, nationality or national origin. A proportion of new homes are designed to be wheelchair adaptable while the allocations process considers the housing needs of tenants in respect of issues that maybe derived from individuals' age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity status, marriage and civil partnership status, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, nationality or national origin. . The potential impact of the recommendations relating to how the Council takes forward the redevelopment of Site 18 are considered in the Equalities Analysis as a background report.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications**

- 7.1 There are no specific staffing or accommodation implications associated with the proposals contained within this report.

## **8.0 Background Reports and Appendices**

- Appendix 1: Proposed CPO of Property
- Appendix 2 Site plans for Site 18 and Canterbury Works
- Appendix 3: HS2 safeguarding Plan
- Appendix 4: CGI of transformer and Vent Shaft Head House
- Appendix 5: WCML Link Maps

Councils Draft response to HS2 Environmental Statement, January 2014  
Equalities Analysis

### **Contact Officers:**

Abigail Stratford  
South Kilburn Programme Manager  
Tel: 0208 937 1026  
Email [abigail.stratford@brent.gov.uk](mailto:abigail.stratford@brent.gov.uk)

Kathy Robinson  
Senior Corporate Solicitor  
Telephone 020 8937 1368  
E-mail: [Kathy.robinson@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Kathy.robinson@brent.gov.uk)

Dave Carroll  
Head of New Initiatives  
Tel: 0208 937 5202  
e-mail: [dave.carroll@brent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.carroll@brent.gov.uk)